R E P O R T  R E S U M E S

ED 020 495 AL 000 956

LANGUAGE, COMMUNICATION AND CONTROL IN NORTH INDIA. WORKING PAPER NUMBER 7.

BY- DAS GUPTA, J. GUMPERZ, JOHN J.
CALIFORNIA UNIV., BERKELEY, LANG.-BEHAV. RES. LAB.

PUB DATE JAN 68

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.08 25P.

DESCRIPTORS- LANGUAGE RESEARCH, *LANGUAGE, *COMMUNICATION (THOUGHT TRANSFER), LANGUAGE ROLE, *SOCIAL MOBILITY, LANGUAGE STANDARDIZATION, *HINDI, INTERACTION, LANGUAGE STYLES, UTTAR PRADESH, NORTH INDIA,

SINCE LINGUISTS HAVE ONLY RECENTLY TURNED FROM GRAMMATICAL ANALYSIS TO CONSIDER THE ROLE OF LANGUAGE IN SOCIETY, THE STUDY OF MODERNIZATION HAS BEEN LEFT LARGELY TO SOCIAL SCIENTISTS WHO CAN HARDLY BE EXPECTED TO DEAL WITH LINGUISTIC QUESTIONS. LANGUAGE PROBLEMS, HOWEVER, ARE KNOWN TO PLAGUE DEVELOPING SOCIETIES. IN POST-INDEPENDENCE INDIA, NATIONAL LANGUAGE, THE LINGUISTIC STATES ISSUE, PROBLEMS OF SCRIPT, AND MINORITY GROUP CLAIMS FOR LINGUISTIC AUTONOMY HAVE LONG PLAYED A DOMINANT PART IN PUBLIC LIFE. SO FAR SUCH PROBLEMS TEND TO BE TREATED PRIMARILY AS CULTURAL OR POLITICAL ISSUES. FEW ATTEMPTS HAVE BEEN MADE TO EXAMINE THEIR RELATION TO MASS COMMUNICATION, SOCIAL MOBILITY, SOCIAL CONTROL, AND OTHER ASPECTS OF SOCIOECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT. THE PRESENT PAPER EXPLORES THIS PROBLEM BY EXAMINING THE LINGUISTIC POLICIES AND PRACTICES OF TWENTIETH CENTURY LANGUAGE SOCIETIES IN THE NORTH INDIAN STATE OF UTTAR PRADESH. THE AUTHORS ATTEMPT TO DEMONSTRATE THE CLOSE INTERDEPENDENCE BETWEEN COMMUNICATION AND POLITICAL PROCESSES BY SHOWING HOW THE POLICIES AND ACTIVITIES OF THESE INTEREST GROUPS BOTH AFFECT INTERNAL COMMUNICATION CHANNELS AND ARE IN TURN AFFECTED BY THEM. (AUTHOR/AMM)

ED020495

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

# LANGUAGE, COMMUNICATION AND CONTROL IN NORTH INDIA

J. Das Gupta and John J. Gumperz

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS [redacted] MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY PAUL KAY

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE [redacted] OWNER."

Working Paper No. 7
Language-Behavior Research Laboratory
January 1968

The Language-Behavior Research Laboratory is funded by a grant from the Institute of International Studies, University of California, Berkeley, whose support is gratefully acknowledged

AL 000956

Since linguists have only recently turned from grammatical analysis to consider the role of language in society, the study of modernization has been left largely to social scientists who can hardly be expected to deal with linguistic questions. Yet, language problems are known to plague developing societies. In post-independence India, for example, national language, the linguistic states issue, problems of script and minority group claims for linguistic autonomy have long played a dominant part in public life. So far, however, such problems tend to be treated primarily as cultural or political issues. Few, if any attempts have been made to examine their relation to mass communication, social mobility, social control and other aspects of socioeconomic development.[1]

Karl Deutsch's early writings suggest that language and literacy are important measures of socioeconomic change, along with other indices such as the rise of political consciousness, the development of marketing systems, etc.[2] But his suggestions have not been followed up systematically. Studies in communication, even when they refer to language, tend to focus on values, attitudes and ideologies--i.e., the content of what is transmitted, without attempting any systematic analysis of the structure of the verbal channels by which messages are propagated.[3]

The present paper explores this latter problem by examining the linguistic policies and practices of twentieth century language societies in the North Indian state of Uttar Pradesh. We will attempt to demonstrate the close interdependence between communication and political processes by showing how the policies and activities of these interest groups both affect internal communication channels and are in turn affected by them.

---

* Work on this paper was in part supported by grants from the National Science Foundation and from the Institute of International Studies, University of California, Berkeley. We are grateful to Miss Patricia Calkins and Dr. Om Talwar for comments and assistance.

By making use of the concepts of mobilization and technical specialization, two distinct processes involved in modernization, we are able to treat specific phenomena being studied as indices of a more general process of change. Social mobilization has been described by Deutsch as the process by which hitherto isolated sectors of the population are drawn into fuller participation in public life, through the opening of channels of communication capable of transmitting information from centers of political control, economic power and innovation to outlying areas.[4] The relatively more intensive communication among individuals of such a mobilized population implies the creation of mass media circulating widely, increased literacy, and a general educational system to sustain both.

The concomitants of technical specialization, on the other hand, have been discussed by Keller.[5] She argues that technology and knowledge in industrialized society have become so diversified and complicated that no single individual can hope to make all relevant decisions. Hence the emergence of strategic elites, groups of experts, whose power depends only on their specialized skill. These strategic elites differ from traditional upper class ruling groups in that they are recruited on the basis of their performance in their speciality, rather than upon any criterion of family or social background. Although Keller does not state this directly, it seems evident that implicit in the concept of strategic elites is the existence of a mobilized population, where social barriers limiting the individual's participation in public affairs are minimized. However, the particular requirements of many of the technical specialities supporting strategic elites tend to limit members' contacts to others with similar skills; once membership in an elite group is obtained, members are relatively cut off from other technical elites and from the general public.

The two processes, mobilization and technical specialization, are thus complementary. Modernization serves at once to broaden popular participation in public life and to increase its technological and communicative complexity. In both modernized and traditional societies, the individual's ability to understand all the details of his environment is limited, but whereas in the latter the barriers are largely social, in the former they are (at least, in principle) technical--i.e., directly connected with the task performed.

Our discussion is based on the premise that social organization is more directly reflected in the language distance--the grammatical and lexical distinctions among the languages, dialects, and speech styles--of the community linguistic repertoire[6] than in the structure of a single language. This approach leads us to predict that whenever interaction among speakers is restricted by social or ecological boundaries, preexisting language differences are reinforced. With the breakdown of such barriers through modernization, or other social change, language differences would be expected to decrease.

The Czech linguist Havranek calls attention to important implications of this approach to verbal communication systems.[7] He observes that because of the widespread use of classical literary languages like Greek and Latin in ancient and medieval times, writings produced in one region could be read and appreciated throughout the contemporary civilized world. Such linguistic uniformity was possible, he argues, only because literary skills were the preserve of a small exclusive literary elite, which had little or no direct contact with vernacular speaking local populations. Communicability over large areas was thus achieved at the expense of serious gaps in internal communication. The rise of national consciousness and the broadening of political and economic participation during the last several centuries has generated pressured tending to remove such intra-societal language barriers.

Following this argument to its logical conclusion, one might suppose that the ideal language situation is one where, to use Ferguson's terms, a single accepted norm of pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary is used for all levels of speaking and writing.[8] Such a system would be well suited for the transmission of objective information. Members would have access to literary resources and could otherwise participate in the full range of available occupations and activities with a minimum of vocabular learning, and without having to master pronunciation and grammatical rules not acquired as part of their home background.

But such a system would be limited in other ways. Wherever language variation is regularly associated with speakers' home background or certain role performances, its very occurrence encodes important social information. A native's ability to diagnose pronunication differences and choice of word and sentence structure gives him information about his interlocutors' social identities, their attitudes and the probable content of their message. In small, homogeneous, closed groups where actors know each other intimately, and where the range of possible discussion topics is limited, this information is largely redundant. Such communities in fact tend to show a minimum of speech diversity. In complex and industrial societies, however, speakers deal with individuals of widely varying cultural background, whose attitudes and values differ from their own. They frequently know little about their interlocutors. Here clues derived from speech performances serve an important function in evaluating what is said, in singling out some items as more important than others, and in generally facilitating the processing of information.

Aside from differences in social background, the communications of technical specialists such as lawyers, physicians, and scientists, are a further source of language variants. Members of these groups communicate more intensively with each other than with outsiders in the area of their

specialty and so tend to generate their own terminological conventions. Knowledge of these conventions becomes part of the skills required for admission to the group. For members themselves, technical parlance serves as a shorthand way of alluding to a whole body of shared knowledge. It eliminates the need for unnecessary elaboration and explanation, speeds up communication within the group, and facilitates development of the specialty. On the other hand, however, the greater the number of technical terms, the greater the communication difficulties for the lay public.

While linguistic diversity thus serves necessary functions in large speech communities, this diversity need not take the form of languages grammatically distinct from local idioms such as Greek and Latin in ancient and medieval Europe. Command over the grammatical intricacies of an otherwise foreign language is obviously unrelated to the performance of most technical and literary tasks, when special styles of one's own language will suffice. Wherever such command is a requirement for recruitment to elite positions, or even more important, wherever it is made a precondition for access to communication media, barriers to mobilization can be quite as restrictive as purely ascriptive barriers of kin and family background. The development of modern standard languages can thus be viewed as a direct consequence of the increasing pressures for democratization and greater popular participation in public life in recent times.

Although the standard languages of modernized nation states are never identical with the spoken idiom, they tend to be similar enough for easy switching from formal or technical speech styles to informal language. The technological requirements of mass communication, and especially those of mass distribution, require that spelling, morphology, and syntax be uniform. There must be generally accepted rules of codification defining what is acceptable grammar and writing, and these must be set down in readily available dictionaries and grammars.

But communicative efficiency requires only that diversity be controlled; it need not be eliminated. Since codification rules apply only to formal modes of communication, they need not apply to all styles of the standard language. Minor differences in accent do not affect communicability; on the contrary, they serve as carriers of social information.

Technical terminologies and the special communicative conventions of strategic elites, on the other hand, pose serious communication problems. For example, very few laymen in the United States can expect to understand the Journal of the American Chemical Society or the full meaning of the official text of a new law, although both follow the codification rules of standard English. But in the U.S., as in other modernized societies, there exists secondary communication media such as Scientific American, Popular Mechanics, Time, etc. These media make a specialty of translating technical terminologies into a language intelligible to the layman. The styles they employ represent a linguistic bridge between strategic elites and the rest of the mobilized population. Internal diversity is functionally related to the requirements of technical tasks and is controlled by codification so that everyone has direct access to as much information as he can utilize without having to rely on others.

Although the Indian situation is in many ways more complex, the general trend toward a decrease in dysfunctional diversity, accompanied by an increase in functional diversity, follows the same pattern as in western societies. Initially, internal diversity was even greater than in ancient Europe. Long before the trends of westernization began, most regions in India exhibited concurrent use of three literary languages, each having its own distinct function. Sanskrit was used mainly for Hindu religious and high literary purposes; Persian as the dominant medium of administration and the regional languages such as Marathi, Bengali and also the precursors of Modern Hindi, Khari Boli and Braj Bhasa served as additional literary

media. All these literary languages furthermore were grammatically distinct from the many often mutually unintelligible local dialects used in informal interaction. A third group of spoken trade or bazaar languages was used for rather limited transactional purposes among the various local communities in market relations and festival situations. To complicate the picture even further many commerical or artisan castes maintained their own special parlances often marked by special secret script which served to protect their activities from outsiders.

Since they were regularly employed in what on other grounds must be considered a single social system, all these language varieties formed a single communication system. But where modernized communication systems are fluid, marked largely by gradual transitions in phonology and lexicon, the traditional Indian system was segmented into a limited set of discrete subdomains, each set off from the others by sharp grammatical and sometimes even script distinctions, as well as by lexical and phonological features. The barriers of ethnic origin, caste and occupation which characterized Indian society were thus reflected by compartmentalization of verbal interaction into distinct communicative spheres.

The implications of such a communication system for social mobility and participation have already been mentioned. Deep barriers of language served to cut off the ordinary resident from much of the information which he needed to conduct his daily affairs. Since land records, money lenders' accounts, administrative regulations and even the religious texts which he needed for his ceremonials were often kept in different languages, he had to rely on the personal mediation of others for access. The system thus favored the formation of a large number of mediating groups whose literary skills were their main stock in trade.

Individuals wishing to enter linguistically marked occupations found their tasks made more difficult by the fact that they had to learn not only the relevant technical skills and the appropriate terminologies but also a whole new set of grammatical rules and the stylistic norms associated with them. In the absence of a public education system, this training could be acquired only through personal apprenticeship; education was a privilege, depending on personal relationships with teachers and on the parent's social standing in the community, not a right. The lack of explicit and generally available codification rules furthermore left the teachers themselves as the sole guardians of what constituted closed communities, whose literary skills were their main assets. Self interest led them to make every attempt to preserve these assets for their own kind. Since each group served as guardian and judge of the authenticity of its own style, it could by manipulation of standards of correctness erect almost unsurmountable access barriers to the technical skills it controlled.

The introduction of English as the official language in the early nineteenth century led to the disappearance of Persian and reduced the social importance of Sanskrit. But for a long time the pattern of internal linguistic barriers remained as before. Historical records from the early days of English occupation in fact give evidence of certain dominant caste groups' attempts to capitalize on their control of English in much the same way that their ancestors had controlled previous literary languages.[9]

English education, however, was public, open to all who had the financial means. This, combined with the fact that the growing governmental bureaucracy opened up more and more opportunities for those with literary skills, soon led to the development of new groups of literati who were outside of the system of traditional occupational ties.[10] Under the influence of these new groups, new vernacular prose styles modeled on English were developed. Gradually, as these were adopted as the official

media in the lower rungs of administration, they began to gain more general acceptance and to displace previous literary languages and special craft idioms. In what is now known as the Hindi area there were two such developing vernaculars, Hindi and Urdu. In the initial stages of their development, they differed primarily in script. The grammatical and lexical base was largely the same. It derived from Hindustani which had been current as a bazaar language throughout Northern India since Mogul times.

The extension of the communication system, liberalization of the access barriers, along with the improved educational facilities, materially increased the size of the mobilized population, providing a base for the spread of nationalism with its demand for further linguistic reforms. With the gradual entry of the masses to the extended political and social scene there arose a general agreement among nationalists that English would eventually have to go.[11] The language of the foreign conqueror could hardly serve as a symbol for the new Indian nation.

Hindustani and its derivatives, Hindi-Urdu, were, to be sure, widely used but they lacked the literary prestige and respectibility of English. It was felt therefore that these new idioms needed to be changed so as to more closely reflect the genius of the nation--i.e., the native literary traditions--and to become the intellectual equal of English.

This goal lent itself to a number of different interpretations, in accordance with the special interests of its advocates. The leaders of the predominantly westernized Muslim elite came largely from Western Uttar Pradesh where Persian influence had been strongest. This led them to introduce a large number of Persian borrowings into what they considered acceptable Urdu. A rival group of Hindi intellectuals, on the other hand, was based in Eastern Uttar Pradesh and Bihar where Sanskrit learning had remained strongly rooted.[12] Their language reforms leaned heavily on

Sanskrit. Each of these groups identified language with their community, invoking and glorifying the history of their respective religious and cultural background, and in this way each tended to drift away from the other. As the Hindu-Muslim conflict grew, literary Hindi and Urdu began to grow more and more distinct, not only from each other but also from the spoken every-day idiom of the urban middle classes. Rising social mobilization and political consciousness were thus accompanied by a widening rift between these two groups and within each group, between the elite and the yet unmobilized masses.

It was Gandhi, the initiator of the first all-India based political mass movement, who first realized the dangers to mobilization which were inherent in the political particularism of the new Hindu and Muslim elites. He accused both the 'Hindi Pandits of Prayag' and the 'Urdu Maulvis of Aligarh' of exaggerating the mutual differences between Hindi and Urdu, pointing out that much of what they rejected as mixed forms was in fact commonly employed throughout North India. He felt that a common language for India should build on popular usage and convention and not on literary injunctions of the Pandits and their political defenders. Gandhi's emphasis on basing linguistic reform on the common elements of popular speech was intended to emphasize three points: unity of the national movement, social and political mobilization of the masses, and the linking of the masses to the successively higher levels of social and political authority.[13]

The intended, as well as the unintended, consequences of the struggle waged over the question of language reform can be better appreciated if one looks into the group processes involved in language politics in India during the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The first organized association devoted to the cause of propagation of Hindi was established in Banaras as the Nagari Pracharani Sabha (1893). It began as a literary association but was soon converted into a political promoter of the cause of Hindi.[14] In

1910, a more exclusively politically oriented association, the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan (HSS), was established at Allahabad by the Hindi oriented leaders of the Indian National Congress.[15] During the earlier years of its existence Gandhi and the Gandhian leaders of Indian National Congress partially succeeded in getting this organization to work for popularizing the idea of a commonly comprehensible national written language as a means of breaking through the barriers of communication between the elite and the masses and bridging the linguistic gulf separating the various regions of India.

Linguistic consensus among the nationalists was shortlived. With the broadening of the base of the national movement, and with the widening mobilization of the masses in the late nineteen twenties, the Hindu-Muslum conflict began to intensify again. Within the Congress Party a new group of political leaders rose who revived the concern for the purity of Hindi. They resisted what they called Gandhi's efforts to conciliate the Muslim demands for Urdu. In their search for symbols of identity, these leaders increasingly identified Hindi with Hindu and Sanskrit culture and returned to the policy of magnifying and sometimes manufacturing divergences between Hindi and Urdu. Frequently, Urdu was branded as an alien language imported by former invaders. In 1935, control over the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan passed into the hands of this latter group of leaders and ultimately Gandhi, Nehru and other proponents of 'broader Hindi' or Hindustani had to resign from the Sammelan.

In 1942, Gandhi and his followers founded the Hindustani Prachar Sabha in order to promote the Hindustani form of Hindi. But this new organization did not succeed in influencing the course of the Hindi movement in North India. It should be noted, however, that the Gandhian efforts were eminently successful in South India. Already in 1918 Gandhi had founded the Dakshina Bharat Hindi Prachar Sabha in Madras for propagating Hindi

in South India. This organization had always worked in close cooperation with the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan. After the split in the Sammelan, it remained aligned more with the Hindustani Prachar Sabha than with the Sammelan.[16] These organizations continued with their efforts to implement Gandhi's policy for a common Indian language. Their Hindi was as close as possible to the urban colloquial style current in Western Uttar Pradesh, Delhi or in the Eastern Punjab (i.e., the area where Hindi originated and where it is commonly spoken by the middle classes, both Muslim and Hindu, and a high proportion of the lower classes), drawing for its technical terms on whatever seemed most popularly accepted, whether Persian, Sanskrit or English. It could be written in either the Urdu or Nagari script, and both were taught in their schools. In line with the Gandhian policy of basic education they emphasized rural literary programs as an integral part of village development through many centers. In addition, a number of highly influential centers for the propagation of Hindi in non-Hindi speaking areas of the South were created.

Whereas Hindi is the most commonly accepted spoken language in Western U. P., the traditional centers of literary learning are largely located in Eastern U. P. Here, the spoken medium of home and friendship groups are such local dialects as Avadhi and Bhojpuri, which are grammatically quite different from Hindi. Hindi is learned as a second language by the Hindu middle classes. Urban Muslim middle classes speak local dialects and learn literary Urdu.[17] Because of the attitude to Hindi as a language of scholarship, the utilitarian policies and lack of literary sophistication found little support here, and instead urban literati tended to align themselves with the HSS.

The HSS spread its organizational roots throughout most of North India, but unlike the Gandhians, its educational efforts were directed primarily toward those who were already somewhat literate in Hindi. It succeeded in

gathering around it the most important Hindi scholars, literary critics, and philologists, as well as some of the most active and productive writers in the Hindi language, many of whom came from Eastern U. P. A new school of Hindi writing developed, including such famous critics as Ram Chandra Shukla and such prose writers as Hazari Prasad Dwivedi and poets such as Maithili Sharan Gupta, who through their writings succeeded in giving literary respectability to the new Hindi.[18] While the works of these writers never achieved the popular success and the wide popular distribution of modern Bengali or Marathi authors, they nevertheless were highly successful in rallying around them the younger Hindi literary elite. There was, in many cases, no formal connection between this group of writers and the HSS, but it was the frequently highly Sanskritized style of these writers which the HSS employed and attempted to promulgate.

One of the most significant organizational achievements of the HSS was the establishment of a network of examination centers for secondary and college diplomas and degrees. Before independence, these Hindi training and examination centers, as well as the Gandhian basic education centers, competed directly with government sponsored educational institutions. After independence, these completing systems were reorganized and directly aided by the U. P. and the national state government.[19]

These educational centers have been unique sources of support for the HSS organization. Financially, they provide substantial funds through training and examination fees. Structurally the HSS acquired a regular, routinized bureaucracy supervising its educational and literary activities in North India and outside. Even before independence few voluntary associations in India working with a political purpose could match the resources of the HSS.[20]

The importance of the HSS educational activities and its vast scale of operation are, however, significant on another level. Thousands of teacher-publicists or 'pracharaks' working through the vast network of educational centers have proved to be effective instruments for codifying the literary Hindi that is learned by the students. This control mechanism is important because it has tended to standardize Hindi in accordance with the HSS leaders' norm of Sanscritized Hindi. The concerted efforts of the examination centers at the base and the Hindi literary elite at the top have tended to remake Hindi in the image of the Eastern U. P. literary language at the expense of many colloquial forms generally accepted in the West

The fact that most Hindi literary scholars are imbued with attitudes towards literary language similar to those of the HSS has had a profound effect on the Indian government's language planning efforts. Under the official government policy, Hindi is eventually to become the national language[21] of India. While English continues to play an important part, more and more the official business both at the state and national level is being transacted in Hindi. In implementing its task of developing Hindi, almost every ministry at the state and national level has set up official committees charged with the task of creating legal and technical terminologies suitable for the new functions the language is filling.

The Board of Scientific Terminology was constituted in 1950. It was assigned the task of preparing 350,000 new terms in Hindi, of which by 1965, 290,000 were already in.[22] For fields other than science, another committee has the responsibility of coining new terms. Various standard manuals are being prepared for different subjects. Glossaries, dictionarie and encyclopedias are being prepared either directly by official committees or by private organizations with official patronage.[23] In 1956, the work of creating an encyclopedia in Hindi was entrusted to the Nagari Pracharani

Sabha, a voluntary association for the promotion of Hindi. In ten years it has produced six volumes.

The stated official policy in regard to newly introduced terms is that they be commonly intelligible. But since Gandhians have paid little attention to the technical aspects of language planning, government language committee staffs have had to be drawn primarily from the ranks of Hindi scholarship, with the result that these terminologies, as well as the official writings in Hindi, are in effect quite close to the literary style advocated by the HSS.

Once pressed into service, the Hindi scholars were quick to bring their basic conviction to bear on the task of language planning. One respecte Hindi expert has articulated some of these convictions in clear terms.[24] He begins with the premise that the development of Hindi is dependent on the creation of a vocabulary that is consistent with the genius[25] of the Indian languages. According to him this is a way of rescuing India from the denationalizing effects of alien languages.[26] All these imply that the development of Hindi is dependent on a conscious policy of Sanskritization. This would be a way of purifying Hindi by purging it of the influence of English and Urdu.

In this sense, the Hindi scholars have interpreted the task of language development as being synonymous with increasing classicalization.[27] But classicalization implies that the literary language diverges sharply from the common speeches bringing in its trail an increasing separation between the media of elite communication and mass comprehension. Evidently, the Hindi scholars are less concerned with standardizing the language for popular use than for retaining its purity from the contamination of the outside influences. Hence, the policy of elitist sanctity has been of greater salience to their conception of language planning than the policy of extension of mass communication.

This conception of language planning has to a certain extent been facilitated by the ambiguity in the constitutional provision concerning the style of official Hindi which while paying homage to the "genius" of Hindi, requires at the same time the reflection of "composite culture" in official Hindi.[28] It is not clear whether "composite culture" refers to a reconciliation of culture conflict based on religion or on resolving the dichotomy between elite and mass culture or both of them taken together. A leading coalition of factions within the Congress and some other parties maintained that official Hindi should be of sufficient common comprehension and, therefore, should be based on composite culture. On the other hand, the Hindi interest associations and generally the Hindi literary elite emphasized more on the question of the genius of Hindi which they identified with classical Sanskritic language and tradition. However, by virtue of political influence and actual influence on language planning, the Hindi scholars and associations have successfully impressed their views on official Hindi as well as the general new Hindi style.

Here are some examples of the new literary style. Items one and two are taken from signboards intended for the public. Item three is from the text of the Indian Constitution as given in the Government of India, Ministry of Law, Manual of Election Law.[29] In each case, line a gives the official text, line b the English translation and line c an approximate equivalent in the colloquial educated style.

Item 1

a. dhuumrpaan varjint hai
b. smoking prohibited
c. sigret piinaa manaa hai

Item 2

a. binaa aagyaaँ praveeš nišeedh
b. entrance prohibited without permission
c. binaa aagyaँ andar jaanaa manaa hai

Item 3

a. raastrapati kaa nirvacin eek aisee nirvaacik gan kee sadasy karẽẽgee jisjmẽẽ
b. the president's election will be done by electors chosen to include
c. raastrapati kaa cunaaoo eek aisee cunee huwee sadasy karẽẽgee jisjmẽẽ

a. (k) sansad-kee doonõõ sadnõõ-kee nirvaacit sadasy tathaa
b. (a) the elected members of both houses of parliament and
c. (k) sansad kii doonõõ sabhaaoo kee cunee huwee sadasy aur

a. (kh) raajyõõ kii vidhaan sabhaaõõ-kee nirvaacit sadasy hõõgee
b. (b) the elected members of the lower houses of state legislatures will be
c. (kh) raajyõõ kii vidhaan sabhaaõõ-kee cunee huwee

On the surface the official language seems to differ from the colloquial style largely in vocabulary. Colloquial terms like manaa, prohibite are replaced by varjit or niseedh, nirvaacin replaces cunaaoo, election, et Such innovations are common in most complex societies and can in part be justified for technical reasons. Many new official terms (all borrowed from Sanskrit) such as sadasy 'member', raastrapati 'president', udyoog 'industry', etc. are in fact becoming more and more commonly accepted in everyday Hindi speech. But the substitution of tathaa for the colloquial aur serve no such technical function. This is one of a series of literary-colloquial alternates which affect a large proportion of the commonly used Hindi

conjunctions, post-positions (post-positions correspond in Hindi to prepositions in English), number terms and other grammatically important function words. Other examples are: yadi for agar 'if', kintu for magar 'but', atah for isliyee 'therefore', saabit for saath 'with', pratharm for pahlaa 'first', etc. Such grammatical variation is more commonly found in traditional literary languages than in modern standard languages.

Furthermore, a number of new grammatical features are being introduced into the literary language, along with the lexical borrowings. Varjit 'prohibited' is derived from the norm varjan by addition of the participal suffix -it. This suffix also occurs in other Sanskrit borrowings such as prakaasit 'published', staapit 'established', etc. Along with the suffix -ik in nirvaacik or audyoogik 'industrial' (from udyoog 'industry'), it is one of a group of new derivative suffixes which are beginning to be more and more frequent. They differ from the other derivational rules in that they affect only words borrowed from Sanskrit and that they may require certain vowel alternations such as the change of initial u- to au- in audyoogik which were common Sanskrit but are not found in the modern vernacular. In syntax, furthermore, the literary style tends towards new norm constructions such as pravees 'entrance', where colloquial Hindi would simply use a verbal derivative such as andar jaanaa (literally) 'going inside.'

Other important innovations are beginning to affect the sound system. The final consonant clusters -mr, -jy, -sy in dhuumr, raajy, sadasy, the final short vowels -i and -u in raastrapati and kintu do not occur in colloquial speech. Words like raajy were used in their colloquial raaj in early Hindi writings. The -y seems to have been added around the turn of the last century as part of the general trend toward Sanskritization.

It seems evident that the new grammatical differences between colloquial and literary Hindi resulting from recent language reform materially add to the ordinary speaker's task of learning literary Hindi. Many of

the new rules are irregular in that they affect only certain parts of the vocabulary. Others affect deeply ingrained pronunciation patterns. Considerable exposure time is required before such rules can be mastered. Many native speakers of Hindi, including some educated persons feel uneasy about their control of literary Hindi. On the other hand, those who have been exposed to the present form of literary Hindi as part of their family background have considerable advantage in the educational system. New barriers to mobilization are being created providing an opportunity for elite particularism to assert itself.

The work of the language planners has aroused considerable public dissatisfaction. Newspapers periodically carry articles which are highly critical of the new Hindi. At one point even Nehru exclaimed in Parliament that the Hindi broadcasts of his own speeches were incomprehensible to him.[30] But since linguistic scholarship in Hindi continues to be under the influence of the Hindi elite, and of those sympathetic to its aims, any effort to stem the present trends involves more than simply a policy decision. Present language training programs will have to be reexamined in light of the need for mobilization and socioeconomic development.

However, even in the absence of government efforts for change, the present language elite as represented by the HSS leaders and their allies, though dominant in the Hindi area and to some extent within the Congress Party language policy makers, cannot take their dominance for granted. Historically, their power has depended upon the fact that their interests were identical with those of the political groups in power. The pattern of dominance achieved so far however must be maintained against substantial opposition both within and outside the ruling party. Because of the relatively fluid nature of the faction system represented by the structure of the Congress Party, the Hindi elite must constantly guard its political resources.

Only in this way can it maintain its strategic position in language planning on a national scale.

The structure of politics in which modern elites operate in India compels them to seek the aid of other groups. Hindi elites cannot achieve their aims without the support from the wider uneducated Hindi-speaking masses including those who themselves would have difficulty in using Sanskritized literary styles. In addition the Hindi elite must build coalitions against the supporters of English and in doing so it must recruit support of non-Hindi associations.

As the struggle over language continues attitudes towards language purity are increasingly affected by the necessity for political compromise. In their efforts to gain mass circulation and general acceptance by new Hindi speakers, recently created literary journals as well as a significant number of younger prose writers are beginning to reject overly Sanscritized literary styles. Thus the logic of mass politics under democracy may once more lead to a decrease in the dysfunctional grammatical differences between colloquial and literary Hindi and create more tolerance for deviant accents. To the extend that the Hindi elite is ready to push the case of Hindi political dominance its efforts should have the unintended consequences of reducing internal communication barriers and facilitating social mobilization and linguistic modernization.

## NOTES

1. For some exceptions to this see Frank A. Rice (ed.), Study of the Role of Second Languages, Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1962; John J. Gumperz, "Linguistic and Social Interaction in Two Communities" in J. J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes, The Ethnography of Communication, American Anthropologist, 1964.

2. See Karl W. Deutsch, Nationalism and Social Communication. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1966.

3. For instance, see Lucian W. Pye (ed.), Communication and Political Development, Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1963 or Richard R. Fagen, Politics and Communication, Boston: Little, Brown, 1966.

4. See Karl W. Deutsch, "Social Mobilization and Political Development," American Political Science Review, vol. 55, no. 3, September 1961, p. 494.

5. See Suzanne Keller, Beyond the Ruling Class, Strategic Elites in Modern Society, New York: Knopf, 1963.

6. John J. Gumperz, op. cit.

7. B. Havranek, "Zum Problem Norm in der Heutigen Sprachwessenschaft und Sprachkultur," International Congress of Linguistics, 4th Actes... Copenhagen, 1936, pp. 151-157.

8. Charles A. Ferguson in Frank A. Rice (ed.), Study of the Role of Second Languages, Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1962, p. 4.

9. R. E. Frykenberg, "Traditional Processes of Power in South India: An Historical Analysis of Local Influence," Indian Economic and Social History Review, vol. 1, 1963, pp. 122-142.

10. Ellen McDonald, "Social Mobilization and Vernacular Publishing in 19th Century Maharashtra," mimeo, 1967, 28 pp.

11. For a representative collection of views of the nationalist leaders see Z. A. Ahmad, ed., National Language for India, Allehabad: Kitabistan, 1941. See especially P. D. Tandon's advocacy of Hindi: "I believe that political freedom cannot come out of cultural slavery to the English Language and things English. I have therefore always stood strongly...

for the exclusion of English from our national...work. India's real self must assert itself through her own languages and particularly through Hindi..." p. 93. (Emphasis added)

12. For accounts of the Hindu and Muslim efforts to emphasize the difference between Hindi and Urdu, see Aziz Ahmad, Studies in Islamic Culture in the Indian Environment, London: Oxford University Press, 1964, especially pp. 239-262, and Ram Gopal, Linguistic Affairs of India, Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1966, especially chapters 4 and 8.

13. For Gandhi's views see M. K. Gandhi, Thoughts on National Language, Ahmedabad: Navajivan, 1956.

14. For an account of the origin of this organization, see Hirak Jayanti Granth, Benaras: Nagari Pracharani Sabha, Sambat 2011, p. 3 (in Hindi).

15. On the development of the H.S.S., see Kantilal Joshi in Rajat Jayanti Granth. Wardha: Rashtrabhasha Prachar Samiti, 1962, pp. 581 ff. (in Hindi).

16. Gandhi also founded in 1936 the Rashtradhasha Prachar Samiti, Wardha for promoting Hindi in the non-Hindi areas not covered by the scope of the Madras Sabha. For accounts of these organizations see Kantilal Joshi's chapter, ibid., pp. 592 ff.

17. See John J. Gumperz, "Language Problems in the Rural Development of North India" in The Journal of Asian Studies, vol. 16, no. 2, February 1957, pp. 251-259.

18. For a brief discussion of the impact of these writers on the new Hindi, see R. A. Dwivedi, A Critical Survey of Hindi Literature. Delhi: Motilel Banarsi Dass, 1966, especially pp. 164-218.

19. In 1962 the H.S.S. and in 1964 the D.B.H. P.S. were recognized by the state as Institutions of National Importance.

20. The financial and other resources of the major Hindi associations are indicated in their annual reports.

21. This means primarily official language of the Union but Hindi is also being made a general link language for non-official purposes. See Report of the Education Commission, 1964-66, Education and National Development, New Delhi: Ministry of Education, Government of India, 1966, pp. 13-16.

22. The Board was later replaced by the Standing Commission for Scientific and Technical Terminology.

23. For samples of the official efforts see for example A Consolidated Glossary of Technical Terms, (English-Hindi), Delhi: Central Hindi Directorate, Ministry of Education, Government of India, 1962, and on translation problems, plans and programs, The Art of Translation, New Delhi: Ministry of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs, 1962. On the problem of translating legal works see M. C. Sharma, Rendering of Laws in Hindi--Its Problems, New Delhi: Ministry of Law, Government of India, 1964. The private efforts have been conspicuously led by Dr. Raghu Vira. His ideas on language planning are summarized in his India's National Language, New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1965 (in English and Hindi).

24. The reference here is to Dr. Raghuvira. See ibid.

25. His attempt to develop Hindi "in consonance with the genius of Indian languages" is discussed in ibid, p. 221.

26. As he points out, "Our languages will again go into the lap of mother Sanskrit, when she was free. We shall have again our own words." Ibid, p. 207.

27. For a valuable discussion of standarization with special reference to major Indian languages see P. S. Ray, Language Standardization: The Hague, Mouton, 1963, especially p. 125 ff.

28. For instance Art. 351 states: "It shall be the duty of the Union to promote the spread of Hindi language, to develop it so that it may serve as a medium of expression for all the elements of the composite culture of India and to secure its enrichment by assimilating without interference with its genius, the forms, style and expressions used in Hindustani and in the other languages of India specified in the Eighth Schedule and by drawing, wherever necessary or desirable, for its vocabulary, primarily on Sanskrit and secondarily on other languages."

29. Ministry of Law, Government of India, Manual of Election Law, Revised Second Edition; Delhi: Manager of Publications, Government of India, 1961.

30. See National Herald, April 5, 1958, and G. C. Awasthy, Broadcasting in India, Bombay: Allied Publishers, 1965, p. 132.